

REMARKS

Claims 1-40 and 49-55 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 16, 24, 34, 49 and 53 are independent. After entry of the above amendments, claims 1-40 and 49-55 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 16, 24, 34, 49 and 53 are independent. Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

**I. OBJECTION**

Claims 2, 17 and 49 are amended to correct the informalities.

**II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 13 is amended to correct to provide the proper dependency.

**III. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 16, 21-23 and 49-55 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,872,054 issued to Gray (hereinafter “Gray”).

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 16-20, 24 and 34-40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,914,753 issued to Donovan (hereinafter “Donovan”).

To further clarify aspect of the invention, claims 1, 16, 24, 34, 49 and 53 are amended. The support for the amendment is found in paragraph [0081, 0082 and 0083].

Under 35 USC 102(b), a rejection is proper if Examiner uses a single reference that teaches or enables each of the claimed elements arranged as in the claim, expressly or inherently, as interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Amended claim 1 recites among other elements, “a store for storing digital image data defining a multiplicity of pixels which together form an image, *wherein said image having a first region and a second region*; a format data table defining a set of parameters for each of a plurality of different image displaying formats, *said set parameters comprising a first parameter*

*for an area of pixel region for said first region and a second parameter for an area of pixel for said second region*” (emphasis added). Amended claim 16 recites among other elements, “storing digital image data defining a multiplicity of pixels which together form an image *having a first region and a second region*; defining a set of parameters for each of a plurality of different image displaying formats, *wherein said set of parameters defining a first parameter for an area of pixel region for said first region and a second parameter for an area of pixel for said second region*” (emphasis added). This recitation is neither disclosed nor taught by the Gray or Donovan reference. Neither reference discloses parameters specifically provided for a two areas of an image. Therefore, in view of the amendments, 102(b) rejection would not be proper.

Amended claim 24 recites among other elements, “an input device for receiving image data defining a multiplicity of pixels that together form an image *having a first region and a second region*; a programmable format data store for storing format data defining a format in which the image data is to be output for display of the image, *wherein said format data defining a first parameter for an area of pixel region for said first region and a second parameter for an area of pixel for said second region*” (emphasis added). This recitation is neither disclosed nor taught by the Gray or Donovan reference. Neither reference discloses parameters specifically provided for a two areas of an image. Therefore, in view of the amendments, 102(b) rejection would not be proper.

Amended claim 34 recites among other elements, “receiving image data defining a multiplicity of pixels that together form an image *having a first region and a second region*; generating format data defining a format in which the image data is to be output for display of the image, *wherein said format defining a first parameter for an area of pixel region for said first*

*region and a second parameter for an area of pixel for said second region”* (emphasis added).

This recitation is neither disclosed nor taught by the Gray or Donovan reference. Neither reference discloses parameters specifically provided for a two areas of an image. Therefore, in view of the amendments, 102(b) rejection would not be proper.

Amended claim 49 recites among other elements, “means for selecting a display format in which the image is to be displayed, said *having a first region and a second region*; and processing means, coupled to the means for reading and to a means for defining, for processing the pixel data to create display data by adding control data corresponding to the format selected for display, *wherein said control data comprising a first parameter for an area of pixel region for said first region and a second parameter for an area of pixel for said second region”* (emphasis added). This recitation is neither disclosed nor taught by the Gray or Donovan reference. Neither reference discloses parameters specifically provided for a two areas of an image. Therefore, in view of the amendments, 102(b) rejection would not be proper.

Amended claim 53 recites among other elements, “selecting a display format in which the image is to be displayed, *said image having a first region and a second region*; and processing the pixel data to create display data by adding control data corresponding to the format selected for display, *wherein said control data comprising a first parameter for an area of pixel region for said first region and a second parameter for an area of pixel for said second region”* (emphasis added). This recitation is neither disclosed nor taught by the Gray or Donovan reference. Neither reference discloses parameters specifically provided for a two areas of an image. Therefore, in view of the amendments, 102(b) rejection would not be proper.

**IV. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 8-14, 24 and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,455,627 issued to Eitzmann (hereinafter "Eitzmann") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,522,362 issued to Nakamoto (hereinafter "Nakamoto").

This recitation provided above for claims 1 and 24 are neither disclosed nor taught by the Eitzmann or Nakamoto reference. Neither reference discloses parameters specifically provided for a two areas of an image. In light of the foregoing amendments to the independent claims and reasons provided above, the Applicant believes that claim 1 and 24 are allowable.

Also, dependent claims 8-14 and 29-33 that depend from allowable claims are also believed to be allowable.

**Remaining dependent claims**


Claims 2-15, 17-23, 25-33, 35-40, 50-52 and 54-55 are in condition of allowance, since they depend from independent claims 1, 16, 24, 34, 49 and 53, respectively.

**REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/28/2004

By:   
Milan Patel (41,242)  
858-651-6892

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 658-5787  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502